

The information below was found online through federal government links of USBR. Data was copied and pasted as follows:

**Detailed Information on the
Bureau of Reclamation: California Federal Bay-Delta (CALFED) Assessment**

- View this [program's assessment summary](#).
- [Visit ExpectMore.gov](#) to learn more about how Federal Government programs are assessed and their plans for improvement.
- [Learn more](#) about detailed assessments.

Program Code	10003725	
Program Title	Bureau of Reclamation: California Federal Bay-Delta (CALFED)	
Department Name	Department of the Interior	
Agency/Bureau Name	Bureau of Reclamation	
Program Type(s)	Capital Assets and Service Acquisition Program	
Assessment Year	2006	
Assessment Rating	Adequate	
	Section	Score
Assessment Section Scores	Program Purpose & Design	80%
	Strategic Planning	89%
	Program Management	75%
	Program Results/Accountability	26%
Program Funding Level (in millions)	FY2008 \$40	FY2009 \$32

- [Ongoing Program Improvement Plans](#)
- [Completed Program Improvement Plans](#)
- [Program Performance Measures](#)
- [Questions/Answers \(Detailed Assessment\)](#)

Ongoing Program Improvement Plans

Year Began Improvement Plan Status Comments

Completed Program Improvement Plans

Year Began	Improvement Plan	Status	Comments
2007	Initiating an independent science board review of the CALFED Program performance measures to determine whether the Program is achieving	Completed	This action responds to deficiencies identified in question 4.5.

	intended results.		
2007	Ensuring that Program goals are achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules. Cost and schedule targets are provided in detail in the recently developed and approved CALFED 10-year Action Plan.	Completed	This action responds to deficiencies identified in question 4.CA1.
2006	Implementing performance-based standards for program and project managers that are linked to the desired outcomes of Program implementation.	Completed	This action responds to deficiencies identified in question 3.2.
2006	Suspending any storage study that at the time of its Draft Feasibility Report does not have a committed local cost-share partner for construction.	Completed	This action is necessary to address the flagging local commitment to the cost-share provisions of the CALFED Act relating to water storage studies.
2007	Implementing the CALFED Act's Section 105 mandate that the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the Governor determine whether the program is making 'balanced progress'.	Completed	This action is intended to trigger a review of progress toward achieving CALFED goals, including an assessment of whether resources and CALFED agency commitments are sufficient to achieve balanced progress.
2007	Ensuring annual performance goals established in the 2006 PART analysis are achieved in 2007. This will require that budget decisions continue to support Program goals and on-going projects maintain aggressive schedules.	Completed	This action responds to deficiencies identified in question 4.2.

Program Performance Measures

Term	Type										
		Measure: Acre-feet of new surface water storage capacity measured in thousands of acre-feet									
Long-term	Outcome	<p><i>Explanation:</i> Increase the surface water storage capacity through construction of new or enlargement of existing reservoirs with a target of 3,500 thousand acre-feet (TAF) of increased storage by 2030. The CALFED ROD identified five storage projects that would provide a total additional surface water storage capacity of about 3,500 TAF. Reclamation was subsequently authorized to prepare feasibility studies for four of these projects (Upper San Joaquin Storage, Shasta Enlargement, Sites Reservoir, and Los Vaqueros Enlargement) and one additional project (San Luis Lowpoint) that all could result in increasing surface water storage capacity. Annual progress towards completion of this goal is described in the next measure.</p>									
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Target</th> <th>Actual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2030</td> <td>3500</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2020</td> <td>1400</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Target	Actual	2030	3500		2020	1400	
Year	Target	Actual									
2030	3500										
2020	1400										

2018 600
 2006 0 0
 2001 Baseline 0

Measure: Percent complete of milestones for on-going surface water storage projects

Explanation: This measure represents the progress made towards implementation of new storage facilities and is tracked through a series of milestones during the planning, design, and construction phases of the on-going projects. In general, the milestones are related to planning, environmental impact analysis, design, permitting, and construction. Completion of these milestones are required before construction can be initiated and completed. Progress toward completion of surface storage projects is reported as percent complete, based on consideration of both the duration and degree of difficulty in completing key milestones. Degree of difficulty considers the complexity of technical work and the significance of decisions to be made by Reclamation and non-Federal partners. Performance targets are based on scheduled completion dates for key milestones associated with four storage projects (Upper San Joaquin Storage, Shasta Enlargement, Sites Reservoir, and Los Vaqueros Enlargement) and one additional project (San Luis Lowpoint) that all have the potential to increase surface water storage capacity.

		Year	Target	Actual
		2001 Baseline	3	
Annual	Output	2001	3	3
		2002	3	3
		2003	9	9
		2004	13	13
		2005	16	16
		2006	19	19
		2007	19	19
		2008	28	28
		2009	34	
		2010	42	
		2011	55	
		2012	56	
		2013	59	
		2014	64	
		2015	68	
		2016	70	
		2017	71	
		2018	72	
		2019	80	
		2020	88	
		2021	92	

Measure: Acre-feet of additional Delta water export capability.

Explanation: Increased Delta export capability will be accomplished through a series of operational and structural actions that will allow greater quantities of water to be exported from the Delta. Implementation of the Intertie between the Delta Mendota Canal and the California Aqueduct is scheduled to be operational by 2009, and the Joint Point of Diversion and increasing the permitted pumping capacity at the State's Banks Pumping Plant to 8,500 cubic feet per second (cfs) are expected to be complete and operational by 2010. Combined, these actions will provide a total of 275 TAF per year of increased Delta export capacity. Ongoing scientific studies addressing the current decline of pelagic organisms in the Delta will provide important information needed for final decisions regarding these actions. Additional actions, such as increasing the permitted capacity of Banks Pumping Plant to 10,300 cfs and enlarging the intertie between the Delta Mendota Canal and the California Aqueduct are currently on hold.

Long-term Outcome

Year Target Actual

2001	Baseline	0
2002	0	0
2003	0	0
2004	0	0
2005	0	0
2006	0	0
2007	0	0
2008	0	0
2009	35	
2010	35	

Measure: Acre-feet per year of unanticipated and uncompensated reductions in exports.

Explanation: The Bay-Delta system provides the water supply for a wide range of in-stream, riparian, and other beneficial uses—such as drinking water for millions of Californians and irrigation water for agricultural land. While some beneficial water uses depend on the Bay-Delta system for only a portion of their water needs, others are highly or totally dependent on Bay-Delta water supplies. As water use and competition among uses has increased during the past several decades, conflicts have increased among users of Bay-Delta water. Heightened competition for the water during certain seasons or during water-short years has magnified the conflicts. Water flow and timing requirements have been established for certain fish and wildlife species with critical life stages that depend on fresh-water flows. These requirements have reduced water supplies and flexibility to meet the quantity and timing of water delivered from the Bay-Delta system. Water suppliers and users are concerned that additional restrictions that may be needed to protect species would increase the uncertainty and further reduce the availability of Bay-Delta system water for agricultural, industrial, and urban purposes. The CALFED Program seeks to reduce the amount of unanticipated and uncompensated reduction in Delta water deliveries. This can

Annual Outcome

be measured by evaluating actions that can disrupt water supply operations and exports from the Delta. The stability of export deliveries is measured as the amount of unanticipated and uncompensated reductions in exports at the SWP and CVP pumps caused by regulatory actions taken to sustain at risk fish populations in the Delta.

Year	Target	Actual
2011	0	
2012	0	
2009	0	
2010	0	
2007	0	5,000
2008	0	0
2005	0	0
2006	0	0
2003	0	0
2004	0	0
2001	Baseline	0
2002	0	0

Measure: Salt discharge reduction per average hydrologic year.

Explanation: A key provision in the CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act directs the Secretary of the Interior to develop and implement a program to meet regulatory water quality standards imposed on the CVP. The principal actions to achieve this objective are included in the Westside Regional Drainage Program (WRDP) that, when fully implemented, will provide the capacity to eliminate agricultural discharge to the San Joaquin River from drainage impaired lands within the Grasslands Drainage Area. The WRDP has developed a schedule for simultaneous implementation of several actions to be completed by 2010. Since 1998, several actions have been implemented resulting in the capacity to reduce salt discharge by about 40,000 tons per year. Additional scheduled actions between 2006 and 2010 will provide additional capacity to permanently reduce a total of about 180,000 tons per year. When the WRDP is fully implemented, salt load discharges will be reduced permanently, and the annual discharge will not be influenced by local hydrologic conditions. Until that time, however, hydrologic conditions have an effect on annual discharges of salt, which is a function of both discharge volume and concentration. For example, during wet years, high volumes of local runoff and higher groundwater tables result in higher than average salt discharged to the San Joaquin River. Consequently, the capacity to reduce salt discharge under average conditions is a more relevant measurement of Program progress than the actual mass of salt discharged during the project implementation period.

Long-term/Annual Outcome

Year	Target	Actual
2006	Baseline	40,000
2007	67,000	65,900
2008	104,000	116,500
2009	171,000	

2010 184,000

Measure: Cost per ton of salt discharge removal.

Explanation: Recently completed studies found the combination of solution components included in the WRDP to be the most cost-effective among several alternatives considered. Implementation focuses first on drainage control components that will reduce the total amount of drainage water, followed by water treatment actions that are needed to assure a sustainable solution. Most of the solution components are to be implemented simultaneously over a multiple-year period. Annual funding requirements in WDRP reports identify the distribution of costs among solution measures. Simultaneous implementation of multiple solution components will achieve targets more rapidly than sequential implementation. This performance measure addresses salt discharge reduction capacity because annual salt discharge during program implementation will be affected by hydrologic variability, which would make accurate assessment of year-to-year progress difficult. This performance measure will demonstrate that the average annual cost per ton of salt removal capacity becomes more cost efficient as solution components are implemented over time. A comparison of baseline costs (based on salt removal capacity developed from 1998 through 2005) to forecasted costs illustrates that the program is designed to become more efficient as it is implemented. This results from the progressive reduction of water volume and the implementation of treatment measures that would assure sustainability of the solutions. This measure also demonstrates that WRDP solution components are more cost-effective than the next least costly alternative, which would involve permanent removal of lands from agricultural production.

Annual

Efficiency

Year Target Actual

2006	Baseline	65
2007	59	44
2008	47	29
2009	33	
2010	36	
2011	45	
2012	45	

Questions/Answers (Detailed Assessment)

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design

Number	Question	Answer	Score
	Is the program purpose clear?		
1.1	<i>Explanation:</i> The purpose of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program (Program) is to develop and implement a long-term comprehensive plan that will restore ecological health and improve water management for beneficial uses of the Bay-Delta system. To practicably achieve this program purpose, CALFED is comprehensively addressing problems of the Bay-Delta system within each of four resource categories: ecosystem quality, water quality, water supply reliability, and levee system integrity. The Program has four objectives: 1) to restore the ecological health of a fragile and depleted Bay-Delta estuary; 2)	YES	20%

improve the water supply reliability for the State's farms and growing cities that draw water from the Delta and its tributaries, including 7 million acres of the world's most productive farmland; 3) protect the drinking water quality of the 22 million Californians who rely on the Delta for their supplies; and 4) protect the Delta levees that ensure its integrity as a water conveyance system and ecosystem.

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Project Description and Purpose and Need (chapter 1); PL 108-361 CALFED Bay-Delta Authorization Act, October 25, 2004, Sections 102(1) California Bay-Delta Program, 103(a)(1) Record of Decision as General Framework;

Does the program address a specific and existing problem, interest, or need?

Explanation: The CALFED Program is intended to address specific needs relating to the adaptive management of the water and ecosystems in the CALFEd solution area: Ecosystem Quality. The health of the Bay-Delta system has declined as a result of a number of factors, including degradation and the loss of habitats that support various life stages of aquatic and terrestrial biota. Further, the decline in health has resulted from activities within and upstream of the Bay-Delta system. Water Supply Reliability. The Bay-Delta system provides the water supply for a wide range of in-stream, riparian, and other beneficial uses such as drinking water for millions of Californians and irrigation water for agricultural land. While some beneficial water uses depend on the Bay-Delta system for only a portion of their water needs, others mostly or totally depend on Bay-Delta water supplies. As water use and competition among uses has increased during the past several decades, conflicts have increased among users of Bay-Delta water. Heightened competition for the water during certain seasons or during water-short years has magnified the conflicts. Water Quality. Good-quality water is required to sustain the high-quality habitat needed in the Bay-Delta system to support a diversity of fish and wildlife populations. In addition, the Bay-Delta system is a source of drinking water for millions of Californians and is critical to the state's agricultural sector. Delta Levees. There is a growing concern that increased levee height (due to ground subsidence), coupled with poor levee construction and inadequate maintenance, make Delta levees vulnerable to failure, especially during earthquakes or floods. Failure of Delta levees can result in flooding of Delta farmland and wildlife habitat. Similarly, levee failure on key Delta islands can draw salty water up in to the Delta, as water from downstream rushes to fill the breached island. This is of particular concern in low-water years when less fresh water is available to repel the incoming salt water. Such a failure could interrupt the water supply for urban, agricultural, and environmental uses, and degrade water quality and aquatic habitats. The problems described above were identified in detail in the CALFED EIS/EIR and Record of Decision (ROD) documents completed in 2000. These problems remain today and require resolution. More recent findings have placed some urgency on resolving the decline of pelagic organisms and levee stability in the Delta, both of which are within the scope of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program.

1.2

YES 20%

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Program Description (Chapter 1); CALFED Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan - Strategic Plan for Ecosystem Restoration, Technical Appendix to the Programmatic EIS/EIR, July 2000, Chapter 1: The Need for Restoration; CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic Record of Decision, August 2000, Sections 2.2.4 - Water Supply Reliability and 2.2.5 - Storage; CALFED Water Quality

Program Plan, Technical Appendix to the Programmatic EIS/EIR, July 2000, Section 1.1 Purpose and Need; CALFED Levee System Integrity Program Plan, Technical Appendix to the Programmatic EIS/EIR, July 2000, Section 1.2 Current Deficiencies - Problem Statements; San Francisco Estuary Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Interagency Ecological Program on Pelagic Organism Decline, Review Panel Report, December 2005; CALFED Levee Stability Program, California Sacramento - San Joaquin Delta Report to Congress USACE Strategy for Action, March 2006; Flood Warnings: Responding to California's Flood Crisis, State of California Resources Agency, Department of Water Resources, January 2005

Is the program designed so that it is not redundant or duplicative of any other Federal, state, local or private effort?

1.3 *Explanation:* The CALFED Program is a collaborative effort among Federal, State and local agencies to coordinate and focus limited resources to address the four Program objectives. Roles, responsibilities, and coordination are defined through a series of agreements between agencies and with local sponsors. It works closely with other programs, thereby avoiding duplication of effort. Other comprehensive efforts, such as CVPIA and the State Water Plan, that address similar objectives are closely coordinated to prevent overlap and duplication. All Federal, state, regional or local agencies and private entities that are or could be involved in projects that address any of the four objectives are involved in coordination and implementation. Therefore, while other Federal, state and local entities are involved with this effort, it is by design and the work is not duplicative. Crosscut budgets are used to identify all related programs and responsible agencies to ensure all related activities are accounted for and tracked. YES 20%

Evidence: Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Charter and Membership; BDPAC Subcommittees Charters and Membership; California Bay-Delta Authority Membership; California Bay-Delta Authority Act, 2003, Article 2 Powers and Duties,, Section 79421; P.L. 108-361 Section 103 (c) Authorizations for Federal Agencies Under Applicable Law, Section 106 Cross-Cut Budget; CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, September 2003; CALFED Programmatic Record of Decision, Attachment 2 Environmental Water Account Operating Principles Agreement, August 2000 Extension of EWA Operating Principles Agreement through December 31, 2007;

Is the program design free of major flaws that would limit the program's effectiveness or efficiency?

1.4 *Explanation:* The CALFED program has gone through several iterations of design and planning. As people become more familiar with the challenges of implementing this program, it has become apparent that some design elements don't work as planned. Some of these issues have been corrected, but other challenges remain. The CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR considered alternative approaches to address the identified water resources problems in the Bay-Delta. The strategy described in the Preferred Programmatic Alternative in the ROD to address the four objectives remains strong, and the adaptive management nature of the program suggests that problems should be addressed to improve the program, instead of abandoning it. The program has challenges in several areas. Recent studies and evaluations have identified some of these, and are taking steps to address them: Governance - The CALFED governance structure is awkward. Many state and federal agencies participate, but they have different NO 0%

goals, and are often unwilling to make CALFED goals as spelled out in the ROD a top priority for their programs. Accountability and Prioritization - Given the interagency nature of the program, it is not clear how certain aspects of the program will play out. For instance, if adequate progress is not made in all program areas, the Secretary of the Interior may declare the program out of balance; funding should then, ideally, be re-allocated to bring the program into balance. However, the Secretary does not have the authority to direct other federal agencies how to prioritize their budgets. Cost-Share - Cost-sharing of CALFED actions is integral to the program, as is the principle that project beneficiaries pay for project costs. It is not clear how either of these concepts will play out in reality. As storage projects reach critical stages in planning, potential project sponsors have been reluctant to step forward and state that they will be responsible for the local cost-share. If those cost-sharing partners do not materialize, it will jeopardize the storage elements of the program. Furthermore, if project sponsors seek to circumvent the cost-share requirements of these projects (such as by pursuing legislation to change the cost-share requirement for a particular project), it will undermine a founding principle of the program and could jeopardize federal participation in the entire CALFED effort.

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Chapter 2, Alternative Descriptions; CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic ROD, August 2000; 10-Year Action Plan and Preparing for End of Stage 1, CBDA Staff Report, April 2006; Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies, March 1983; P.L. 108-361, Section 107 Federal Share of Costs

Is the program design effectively targeted so that resources will address the program's purpose directly and will reach intended beneficiaries?

Explanation: The CALFED ROD and authorizing legislation are both very detailed in particular actions to be undertaken; given that most of these actions require a local cost-share, the program is well designed to ensure that resources go where they are intended and needed. Possible exceptions to this are programs that rely on the authority and appropriations of other federal programs - for instance, both the levee stability program and the water quality program have not seen a great deal of ownership through the CALFED process. The preferred alternative identified in the ROD describes specific implementation actions designed to effectively target resources towards directly addressing the program's purpose. Many of the actions require cost-sharing agreements and are implemented by the intended beneficiary. Several other actions are still in the early planning phases and the results of these efforts will include recommendations on cost-effectiveness and allocations of cost to appropriate beneficiaries. This is consistent with a key guiding principle of the CALFED Program that beneficiaries pay, as well as the Principles and Guidelines used by Federal agencies to determine project feasibility and cost allocation. Real-time coordination with inter-agency groups and stakeholders take place to ensure transparency regarding decision-making and that project operations are effectively targeted to achieve intended benefits. As an example, the EWA Program is designed to protect at risk native fish species in the Delta above the 'regulatory baseline' defined in the ROD, while ensuring water supply reliability. EWA water assets benefit State and Federal project water users.

1.5

YES 20%

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Chapter 2, Alternative Descriptions (Preferred Alternative); CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic ROD, August 2000; Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources

Implementation Studies, March 1983; Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Charter and Membership; BDPAC Subcommittees Charters and Membership; CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR, Attachment 2 Environmental Water Account Operating Principles Agreement, August 2000; CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, September 2003 (WOMT and CALFED Operations groups)

Section 1 - Program Purpose & Design Score 80%

Section 2 - Strategic Planning

Number	Question	Answer	Score
--------	----------	--------	-------

Does the program have a limited number of specific long-term performance measures that focus on outcomes and meaningfully reflect the purpose of the program?

2.1	<p><i>Explanation:</i> The program has three long-term performance measures dealing with 1) increasing surface water storage capacity; 2) expanding water export capability through the Delta; and 3) reducing salt discharge to the San Joaquin River. These performance measures only reflect portions of the overall CALFED program, but do focus on most of the elements for which Reclamation is responsible.</p>	YES	11%
-----	--	-----	-----

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Section 2.2.4 - Water Supply Reliability

Does the program have ambitious targets and timeframes for its long-term measures?

2.2	<p><i>Explanation:</i> Long term targets and timeframes for the program's measures are very ambitious. The development of any new significant storage capacity in California has not happened for over two decades and is very contentious. The targets and timeframes for increased storage capacity assume that 3.5 million acre-feet of new storage will be developed by 2030, which will require construction of between 2-4 new reservoirs - none of which have been shown to be feasible, economically viable, or have project cost-share partners at this time, nor have they been authorized. Increasing the export capability in the Delta is also controversial. Initial targets established in the CALFED ROD have been updated due to environmental concerns with increasing Delta exports. These long-term targets are especially ambitious due to the legal, environmental, and funding challenges related to implementation.</p>	YES	11%
-----	---	-----	-----

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Sections 2.2.4 - Water Supply Reliability, 2.2.5 - Storage, 2.2.6 - Conveyance, 2.2.7 - Environmental Water Account, 2.2.8 - Water Use Efficiency

Does the program have a limited number of specific annual performance measures that can demonstrate progress toward achieving the program's long-term goals?

2.3	<p><i>Explanation:</i> The program has annual measures that reflect progress towards achieving its long-term goals for water storage and salt load reduction; there is no annual measure that demonstrates progress towards meeting the long-term measure for Delta water export capability. The development of new storage is a long process with many technical, administrative, and political steps in order to initiate and ultimately complete implementation. The progress made towards completing this process is being measured annually through the completion of specifically defined milestones on all individual projects. Each milestone</p>	YES	11%
-----	---	-----	-----

represents a significant step forward towards initiating and completing implementation. Reduction in salt load to the San Joaquin River is linked to increasing flexibility of Federal and State project operations to meet water quality requirements.

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Section 2.2.7 Environmental Water Account; CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Sections 2.2.5 Storage, 2.2.6 Conveyance, 2.2.9 Water Quality; Westside Regional Drainage Plan, May 2003; Grassland Drainage Area, In-Valley Drainage Solution Projects, Summary Brief, February 2006;

Does the program have baselines and ambitious targets for its annual measures?

Explanation: At this time the program has established ambitious targets for all of its annual measures, but has only established baselines for one of them (percent completion of milestones for storage). The program should have established baselines by the end of the PART process, at which time this answer will likely be changed to a 'yes'. The annual measure of uncompensated water loss will use the detailed description in Section 2.2.7 of the CALFED ROD as the baseline, also referred to as the "Regulatory Baseline". The annual targets for the level of environmentally beneficial changes in operations during Stage 1 of Program implementation were set relative to this baseline. Although the target for this measure has been achieved every year since 2001, it has not experienced a below average or critically dry water year. In the long-term, it is very ambitious to expect the annual targets to be met because of uncertain hydrology from year-to-year as well as uncertain funding to purchase enough water to meet the target. Annual targets for long-term Delta export targets were established based on actions anticipated to be implemented during Stage 1, and also are based on the baseline in the ROD and the EIS/R. The long-term target for total salt load reduction is based on analysis completed and documented in the Westside Regional Drainage Program and subsequent updates.

2.4

NO 0%

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Section 2.2.7 Environmental Water Account; CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Sections 2.2.5 Storage, 2.2.6 Conveyance, 2.2.9 Water Quality; Westside Regional Drainage Plan, May 2003; Grassland Drainage Area, In-Valley Drainage Solution Projects, Summary Brief, February 2006; CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Attachment A. Operating Assumptions

Do all partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) commit to and work toward the annual and/or long-term goals of the program?

Explanation: As a cooperative program, CALFED has extensive agreements and documentation showing the commitment of its many partners to achieving the program's goals. In reality, those commitments have not always materialized. Different federal agencies place different importance on CALFED as a factor in determining their budget requests. Also, there has been a lackluster commitment on the part of local project sponsors to step forward and make the financial commitments to comply with cost-share and beneficiary pays provisions of the CALFED program. At this time these problems are not significant enough for a 'no', but they are cause for serious concern as to the program's future viability. Several formal agreements have been completed at various levels of the Program that demonstrate the CALFED agencies and stakeholders

2.5

YES 11%

commitment to work towards the annual and long-term goals of the Program. Of most significance is the Bay-Delta accord, which was a commitment of the CALFED agencies and stakeholders to work together to resolve the conflict in the Delta. This resulted in the development and implementation of a preferred alternative described in the Framework for Action and CALFED PEIS/R and formalized by all agencies in the Record of Decision. Subsequent to the signing of the ROD by all CALFED agencies, numerous agreements have continued to be developed and formalized among the implementing local, State, and Federal agencies. With respect to Reclamation's activities, formal agreements are currently in place for implementation of the EWA Program, the ongoing planning studies, and the salinity management activities.

Evidence: Most relevant signed agreements include: Bay-Delta Accord (December, 1994); CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic ROD, August 2000 ; CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, September 2003; CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR, Attachment 2 Environmental Water Account Operating Principles Agreement; Extension of EWA Operating Principles Agreement through December 31, 2007; August 2000, Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Charter and Membership; Cooperative agreements with water districts implementing salt load reduction actions (2006 agreement currently under development); Cost-share agreement with DWR on storage, conveyance, and water quality planning investigations (currently under development).

Are independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality conducted on a regular basis or as needed to support program improvements and evaluate effectiveness and relevance to the problem, interest, or need?

Explanation: In 2005, an independent review took place focusing on the Program governance, oversight, management, and project and fiscal tracking. This review was initiated by California's Governor as was accomplished by the State Department of Finance, the Little Hoover Commission, and KPMG. This independent analysis culminated in a report from each of the reviewing entities describing the results of the review and specific recommendations for enhancing Program management. The recommendations have been reviewed by the CALFED agencies, which together are developing an action plan describing how the recommendations will be incorporated. The action plan includes ensuring future independent reviews of the Program on a regular basis. One of the major implementation actions in Stage 1, the EWA Program, has been reviewed every year and will be reviewed every two years in the future by an independent technical review panel. The purpose of this review is to evaluate agency cooperation, the overall operations of the Program in terms of water acquisitions, actions taken to protect fish, asset management, and ultimately to provide recommendations on improving future Program performance. These reviews have indicated the Program has been effective in achieving the results of modifying Project operations at no uncompensated cost to water users.

2.6

YES 11%

Evidence: Still Imperiled Still Important - The Little Hoover Commissions Review of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, November 2005; California Department of Finance Draft Report Implementation Status of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Years 1 through 5, November 2005; California Department of Finance Office of State Audits and Evaluations Fiscal Review CALFED Bay-Delta Program Summary of Expenditures as of September 30, 2004, October 2005; KPMG Independent Review CALFED Interview and Survey Findings Report, October 2005 ; EWA Review Panel documents, including science reviews of the EWA Program; 10-Year Action Plan and Preparing for End of Stage 1, CBDA

Staff Report, April 2006;

Are Budget requests explicitly tied to accomplishment of the annual and long-term performance goals, and are the resource needs presented in a complete and transparent manner in the program's budget?

Explanation: The CALFED budget request has not been explicitly tied to the newly-proposed performance goals, because those goals per se did not exist. However, the budger request has been clearly tied to achieving particular goals spelled out in the Stage 1 goals for the CALFED program, therefore, this question merits a 'yes' answer. Additionally, the development and submission of the CALFED budget crosscut for the past two years has increased the transparency of the budget request. The CALFED agencies complete annual program plans that describe each agencies future budget requests and needs and how they relate to Program priorities and expected accomplishments. The previous years accomplishments and overall Program progress are reported in an annual report that is sent to the State legislature and Congress. These reports are reviewed by stakeholders who provide formal recommendations to the agencies on the content. These recommendations are considered before the reports are finalized. Reclamation Budget Justification documents tie the funds requested to specific Program actions and authorized activities and describe the use of those funds. As a result of the 2005 independent reviews, CALFED agencies are developing a more robust process to enhance the tracking of the Program accomplishments related to performance measures and in strategic planning to identify future priorities. In 2004, a detailed finance plan was prepared that identified specific resource needs for all aspects of Program implementation. This report has been utilized in identifying appropriate budget requests. The 10-year action plan includes updated information on resource needs for priority Program activities along with the expected funding sources.

2.7

YES 11%

Evidence: FY 2007 Reclamation California Bay-Delta Restoration Budget Justification; Administration's FY 2007 Budget Request to Congress, Analytical Perspectives volume, Chapter 11, "California-Federal Bay-Delta Program Budget Crosscut (CALFED)", and accompanying CD-ROM. California Bay-Delta Authority Act, 2003, Chapter 2 California Bay-Delta Authority, Article 2 Powers and Duties, Section 79421 (f); California Bay-Delta Authority Act, 2003, Chapter 2 California Bay-Delta Authority, Article 2 Powers and Duties, Section 79423; P.L. 108-361 Section 105(a); CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, D - CALFED Governance and Implementation Procedures, 3 Planning, Budget, and Implementation Procedures, September 2003; CALFED Multit-Year Program Plans (Sample - Years 6 through 9 Conveyance Program); CALFED Bay-Delta Program Finance Plan, California Bay-Delta Authority, January 2005; CALFED Annual Report Sample - 2004

Has the program taken meaningful steps to correct its strategic planning deficiencies?

Explanation: As stated in question 2.7, CALFED agencies are developing a more robust process to enhance the tracking of the Program accomplishments related to performance measures and in strategic planning to identify future priorities. Additionally, the results of the Hoover Commission and the CALFED 10-Year Action Plan should help with the program's strategic planning challenges.

2.8

YES 11%

Evidence: 10-Year Action Plan and Preparing for End of Stage 1, CBDA Staff Report, April 2006;

Has the agency/program conducted a recent, meaningful, credible analysis of alternatives that includes trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals, and used the results to guide the resulting activity?

2.CA1 *Explanation:* The CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR considered alternative approaches to address the identified water resources problems in the Bay-Delta and considered trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals. The Program is designed such that several ongoing studies underway and scheduled to be completed by the end of Stage 1 will inform the Program on investment decisions in the future. The studies that are relevant to federal investment decisions are being conducted consistent with the Principles and Guidelines and Water and Related Land Resources Development and will also consider trade-offs between cost, schedule, risk, and performance goals. The Program will utilize the information from these studies and input from various public stakeholder involvement processes to make a decision on whether the preferred alternative described in the ROD is still the most effective solution.

Evidence: 10-Year Action Plan and Preparing for End of Stage 1, CBDA Staff Report, April 2006; CALFED Bay-Delta Program Programmatic EIR/EIS, July 2000, Chapter 2, Alternative Descriptions

Section 2 - Strategic Planning Score 89%

Section 3 - Program Management

Number	Question	Answer Score
--------	----------	--------------

Does the agency regularly collect timely and credible performance information, including information from key program partners, and use it to manage the program and improve performance?

3.1	<p><i>Explanation:</i> CALFED is designed as an adaptive management program, thus integrating performance information into CALFED planning and implementation is integral to the program. Environmental Water Account (EWA) implementing agencies, in collaboration with the CALFED Science Program (including the Interagency Ecological Program(IEP)), collect, synthesize, and apply scientific information relevant to the biological needs and population dynamics of anadromous and Delta fish species and to factors affecting the health and function of the Bay-Delta ecosystem. Through this process, methods for estimating species abundance and distribution have been improved. In addition, annual EWA actions and assets are tracked closely throughout the year by the Program partners through the Data Assessment Team (DAT) and Water Operations Management Team (WOMT). This information is used to identify resource needs, plan future actions, determine compensation required for project water users, and identify cost-effective approaches to acquire future assets. Salinity management actions are being closely monitored through cooperative agreements with project partners implementing specific activities. Planning studies are using scientific models to measure long-term average water supplies that could be made available to for multiple CALFED objectives to help set meaningful and ambitious performance targets. Studies are reviewed regularly to identify necessary adjustments in schedule and resource needs to assure their timely completion.</p>	YES 12%
-----	--	---------

Evidence: EWA Review Panel documents, including science reviews of the EWA Program; CALFED Water Operations Website includes information on monitoring, protocols, and priorities for EWA operations based on real-time coordination and monitoring.

<http://www.woco.water.ca.gov/calfedops/2005ops.html>; Cooperative agreements

with water districts implementing salt load reduction actions (2006 agreement currently under development), cost-share agreement with DWR on storage, conveyance, and water quality planning investigations (currently under development); Grassland Drainage Area, In-Valley Drainage Solution Projects, Summary Brief, February 2006; CALFED Storage Program Annual Progress Reports (most recent sample, April 2005); P.L. 108-361 Section 105(a) Report

Are Federal managers and program partners (including grantees, sub-grantees, contractors, cost-sharing partners, and other government partners) held accountable for cost, schedule and performance results?

Explanation: CALFED has numerous oversight and reporting requirements, combined with very specific goals and schedules, to there is a large degree of accountability. Reclamation is making progress in terms of implementing performance-based standards for its managers. Unfortunately at the time of this evaluation those standards are not in place, therefore a 'yes' answer is not justified for this question. Reclamation is in the process of developing a performance-based standards program for program and project managers. Although this agency process is not yet in place, CALFED Program and project managers are closely scrutinized by BDPAC and sub-committees, congress, and the legislature. As directed in both State and federal legislation, the Secretary and the Governor must review progress of implementation and if not keeping schedule or if not progressing in a balanced manner, the Secretary and the Governor must revise schedule to reflect to achieve balanced progress consistent with the intent of the ROD. Specifically for EWA implementation, regulatory agencies are responsible to assess data and identify operational adjustments to protect fish. Reclamation and DWR are held accountable to no uncompensated water cost by water contractors through the Data Assessment Team, which includes water contractors and the public, and Water Operations Management Team. For salt load reduction, cooperative agreements hold districts accountable to specific actions, budgets, and for tracking key performance information. Study progress is tracked through schedule meetings with Reclamation management on a regular basis to ensure appropriate progress is occurring. Schedules and resource needs are reported annually in the CALFED Program Plans.

3.2

NO 0%

Evidence: P.L. 108-361 Section 105(b) Progress and Balance; California Bay-Delta Authority Act, 2003, Chapter 2 California Bay-Delta Authority Article 2 Powers and Duties, Section 79421(e), (f), & (g); California Bay-Delta Authority, Consideration of a resolution adopting the 2005 statement of program accomplishments and progress, directing it be included in the annual report and transmitted to the governor, secretary of the interior, legislature and congress, as well as other interested parties, December 8, 2005; Still Imperiled Still Important - The Little Hoover Commissions Review of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, November 2005; California Department of Finance Draft Report Implementation Status of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Years 1 through 5, November 2005; California Department of Finance Office of State Audits and Evaluations Fiscal Review CALFED Bay-Delta Program Summary of Expenditures as of September 30, 2004, October 2005; KPMG Independent Review CALFED Interview and Survey Findings Report, October 2005 ; CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, September 2003 (WOMT and CALFED Operations groups); Cooperative agreements with water districts implementing salt load reduction actions (2006 agreement currently under development), cost-share agreement with DWR on storage, conveyance, and water quality planning investigations (currently under development); CALFED Multi-Year Program Plans (Sample

Years 6 through 9 Conveyance Program)

Are funds (Federal and partners') obligated in a timely manner, spent for the intended purpose and accurately reported?

3.3 *Explanation:* Reclamation's obligation rates are approximately 95-98%, and for the most part the CALFED program has had a similar obligation rate. For several years CALFED did have a significant annual carryover balance due to delayed work for a single project, but that one incident is not significant enough to merit a 'no'. The obligation rate is monitored monthly through a variety of financial reports. Some program expenditures and obligations may change during the fiscal year, and Interior has guidelines the program office follows in approving reprogramming requests. Some may require congressional notification. YES 12%

Evidence: Report on obligation rates will be provided at the end of the fiscal year. Bureau of Reclamation apportionment documents show carryover balances that mostly show expected obligation rates (based on two-year outlay projections), but also show some high carryover balances for the CALFED account due to a single project.

Does the program have procedures (e.g. competitive sourcing/cost comparisons, IT improvements, appropriate incentives) to measure and achieve efficiencies and cost effectiveness in program execution?

3.4 *Explanation:* The program has procedures to measure and achieve efficiencies and effectiveness, but because its efficiency measure lacks a baseline, it cannot receive a 'yes' answer. Several procedures are in place to measure efficiency and effectiveness of the Environmental Water Account (EWA) program. These measures evaluate operational decision-making, the efficiency of EWA asset use, and the timeliness of water contracting, and they are in the EWA Multi-Year Program plan. However, the program's efficiency measure (relating to salt removal) does not have a baseline. Planning studies are being completed with the support of industry-leading engineering and planning firms through an established competitive IDIQ Contracting process. This process ensures a streamlined procurement process that minimizes the time to process contracts. These pre-qualified firms are procured through consideration of technical qualifications and cost to the government. NO 0%

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Environmental Water Account Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 6-9), July 2005; Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Solicitation, Offer and Award for Mid-Pacific Region planning to support CALFED Program studies

Does the program collaborate and coordinate effectively with related programs?

3.5 *Explanation:* As described in question 1.3, the CALFED Program is a collaborative effort among Federal, State and local agencies to coordinate and focus limited resources to address the four Program objectives. Roles, responsibilities, and coordination are defined through a series of agreements between agencies and with local sponsors. The effectiveness of this collaboration is questionable in terms of producing results, but this is not due to lack of effort on the part of program managers, but rather reflects the nature of an inter-agency program. Other comprehensive efforts, such as CVPIA and the State Water Plan, that address similar objectives are closely coordinated to prevent overlap and duplication. All Federal, state, regional or local agencies and private entities that are or could be involved in projects that address any of YES 12%

the four objectives are involved in coordination and implementation. Crosscut budgets are used to identify all related programs and responsible agencies to ensure all related activities are accounted for and tracked.

Evidence: Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) Charter and Membership; BDPAC Subcommittees Charters and Membership; California Bay-Delta Authority Membership; California Bay-Delta Authority Act, 2003, Chapter 2 California Bay-Delta Authority Article 2 Powers and Duties, Section 79421; P.L. 108-361 Section 103 (c) Authorizations for Federal Agencies Under Applicable Law, Section 106 Cross-Cut Budget; CALFED Amended and Restated Implementation Memorandum of Understanding, September 2003; CALFED Programmatic EIS/EIR, Attachment 2 Environmental Water Account Operating Principles Agreement, August 2000; Extension of EWA Operating Principles Agreement through December 31, 2007

Does the program use strong financial management practices?

Explanation: The Federal Finance Accounting system is used to track expenditures against each project on a monthly basis, and more frequently when necessary. Tracking includes auditing categories of expenditures to ensure consistency with project intent. As appropriate, every contract has a financial plan supervised by the COTR and the Contracting Officer. The COTR certifies that the information is accurate and timely. The CFO assures that Reclamation systems meet all legal and financial requirements.

3.6

YES 12%

Evidence: Strong program financial management practices are fully documented in an Independent Auditors Report on Reclamations financial statements for FY 2004 and FY 2005 (December 28, 2005 Memorandum from the Office of Inspector General to Reclamation). The Mid-Pacific Region has a budget team that monitors obligations and expenditures, accomplishes necessary analysis and provides timely reports to all levels of management, stakeholders and others.

Has the program taken meaningful steps to address its management deficiencies?

Explanation: Through the recent completion of the 10-year action plan, the program has taken steps to address its management deficiencies. It is not clear where those steps will lead, but over the past year momentum has been developing to address the widely acknowledged management problems with the program. As identified through independent reviews of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program and California Bay-Delta Authority, management deficiencies exist in the coordination of actions by multiple Federal and state agencies and in overall Program decision-making. These deficiencies are being addressed and documented in the 10-year action plan. To date, management deficiencies have not been identified within the authority or performance of Reclamation in administering the Bay-Delta Restoration Account, which is the focus of this PART.

3.7

YES 12%

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program, 10-Year Action Plan, April 2006.

Is the program managed by maintaining clearly defined deliverables, capability/performance characteristics, and appropriate, credible cost and schedule goals?

3.CA1

YES 12%

Explanation: The program, through the original ROD and authorizing legislation, has clearly defined deliverables, schedules, and goals, that form the basis for

program management. Specific performance characteristics and cost and schedule goals for the Environmental Water Account (EWA) Program are defined in the ROD under section 2.2.7. These are updated annually and documented in the EWA multi-year program plans and annual reports. Feasibility studies for storage and conveyance projects have been structured to include several interim clearly defined deliverables that will be used to support decisions on continued study and non-Federal participation. Performance characteristics for storage and conveyance projects are based on requirements described in the Principles and Guidelines. Contracting requirements for professional services to support feasibility studies include several cost and schedule goals to assure timely and cost-effective performance.

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Programmatic ROD, August 2000, Sections 2.2.7 Environmental Water Account; CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Environmental Water Account Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 6-9), July 2005; Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Solicitation, Offer and Award for Mid-Pacific Region planning to support CALFED Program studies; Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies, March 1983;

Section 3 - Program Management Score 75%

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability

Number	Question	Answer	Score
	Has the program demonstrated adequate progress in achieving its long-term performance goals?		
4.1	<p><i>Explanation:</i> The program has made some progress in meeting its long term goals, but it is a program with a ver long-term horizon, therefore only minimal progress has been made toward acheiving those goals. Additional, progress has been slower than it likely would have been due to a lack of comprehensive federal authorization and limited federal fudning since the CALFED ROD was approved. 2006 is the first year since the CALFED ROD was approved and the comprehensive federal authorization was signed into law that significant funding was provided to Reclamation for CALFED implementation. With this being the case, adequate progress has been made in developing reasonable performance goals with long-term targets and measurement mechanisms.</p> <p><i>Evidence:</i> See Performance measures</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%
4.2	<p>Does the program (including program partners) achieve its annual performance goals?</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i> The CALFED program has been around in various forms for many years, but only through the PART process has it established performance measures and targets. Some of these targets have been 'achieved' retroactively; there are other areas where the program has made some progress. Achieving targets retroactively is not sufficient for a 'yes' (and for many of these measures baselines are still being established), but there is sufficient evidence of progress to justify a 'small extent' answer. It should be noted that while this program was for several years not funded through the CALFED account, many program activities were in fact funded through Reclamation's Water and Related Resources account. Adequate progress has been made in developing annual performance goals, targets, and measurement mechanisms. Although there has been no funding for these activities from the California Bay-Delta Restoration account until 2006, the</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%

primary activities being funded in 2006 and planned for 2007 have made significant progress towards the annual performance goals, as follows: the EWA Program has been successful at meeting the annual performance goal of ensuring no uncompensated water loss to CVP and SWP contractors every year over the last five years; the program partners implementing salt load reduction measures have made significant progress every year since 1998 in reducing salt load into the San Joaquin River; and significant progress has been made and aggressive schedules are in place to complete feasibility studies for potential water storage and conveyance projects.

Evidence: See Performance measures; CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Environmental Water Account Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 6-9), July 2005; Westside Regional Drainage Plan, May 2003; Grassland Drainage Area, In-Valley Drainage Solution Projects, Summary Brief, February 2006;

Does the program demonstrate improved efficiencies or cost effectiveness in achieving program goals each year?

4.3	<p><i>Explanation:</i> The program's one efficiency measure has not yet established a baseline, therefore its improvement in efficiency cannot be determined. Additionally, the program may not receive anything other than a 'no' answer because it received a 'no' to question 3.4. Since the EWA Program was initiated in 2001, it has significantly improved implementation efficiencies in its use of operational assets, dedicated pumping capacity in the Delta, and water acquisitions. The result has been a reduction in assets required and the negotiated price of water.</p>	NO	0%
-----	---	----	----

Evidence: CALFED Bay-Delta Program, Environmental Water Account Multi-Year Program Plan (Years 6-9), July 2005; EWA Review Panel documents, including science reviews of the EWA Program;

Does the performance of this program compare favorably to other programs, including government, private, etc., with similar purpose and goals?

4.4	<p><i>Explanation:</i> No comparable Federal, State or local government program exists that is as comprehensive as the CALFED Program that could be evaluated for comparison in a reasonable timeframe. There are, though, other federal programs that have a large cooperative component. For example, the restoration of the Everglades in Florida, and the Multi Species Conservation Program on the Lower Colorado River all rely on extensive cooperative and coordination to go forward. However, each of these programs is unique, and any comparison of these programs based on their similarities would be extraordinarily complex and of questionable utility.</p>	NA	0%
-----	--	----	----

Evidence:

Do independent evaluations of sufficient scope and quality indicate that the program is effective and achieving results?

4.5	<p><i>Explanation:</i> There have been several reviews in recent years that indicate the program is making some progress, although it is behind schedule. In 2005, an independent review took place focusing on the Program governance, oversight, management, and project and fiscal tracking. The findings indicated that the Program has been achieving results, but is significantly behind the schedule in the CALFED ROD. More specific to Reclamation's piece, the EWA Program has been reviewed every year and will be reviewed every two years</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%
-----	---	-----------------	----

in the future by an independent, multi-disciplinary technical review panel. The purpose of this review is to evaluate agency cooperation, the overall operations of the Program in terms of water acquisitions, actions taken to protect fish, asset management, and ultimately to provide recommendations on improving future Program performance. These reviews have indicated the Program has been effective in achieving the results of modifying Project operations at no uncompensated cost to water users. With regards to the goal of increasing storage, the feasibility studies have not yet been completed to identify the most cost-effective and efficient projects to move forward with into implementation.

Evidence: EWA Review Panel documents, including science reviews of the EWA Program; CALFED 10-year Action Plan; Little Hoover Commission Report; Department of Finance Report; KPMG Report

Were program goals achieved within budgeted costs and established schedules?

4.CA1	<p><i>Explanation:</i> Many of the schedules in the CALFED ROD have not been achieved, due to funding not aligning with schedules established in the ROD, and to a delay in authorization of the CALFED program. Schedules have been formally readjusted to reflect more realistic future funding levels from the federal, state, and local governments. The EWA Program has achieved the desired goals at less cost than was presented in the ROD. Progress on new storage has been less than anticipated in the ROD due to reasons above.</p>	SMALL EXTENT	7%
-------	---	-----------------	----

Evidence: CALFED 10-year Action Plan; EWA Program Plan; CALFED ROD;

Section 4 - Program Results/Accountability Score 26%

- View this [program's assessment summary](#).
- [Visit ExpectMore.gov](#) to learn more about program assessment and improvement by the Federal Government.
- [Learn more](#) about detailed assessments.

Last updated: 01092009.2006FALL